

RECEIVED  
11-4-02

#18 / Reconsideration  
May  
11/5/02

PATENT

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Dianna L. Cleveland	)	Examiner:
Appl. No.:	09/483,445	)	Motilewa A. Good Johnson
Filed:	Jan. 14, 2000	)	Group Art Unit: 2672
For:	METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PREPARING CUSTOMIZED READING MATERIAL	)	

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL**

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Assistant Commissioner:

In the Office Action mailed Oct. 25, 2002, the Examiner refused to enter the Amendment After Final because it raised new issues, stating: "a 'unique' indicia applied to the dialogue of a first character was not previously claimed." **That is wrong as the "unique" language was in the original claims.**

"Page 7 of the Amendment After Final states: "Claims 30 and 39 previously defined this "unique" indicia, so this does not raise a new issue requiring further examination." The pertinent language of Claims 30 and 39 are quoted at page 6 of the Amendment After Final as follows: "original Claim 30 ("presented in an indicia that is unique to each character"); and original Claim 39 ("means for presenting the selected text in a unique indicia")."

Claim 30 defines dialogue associated with a plurality of characters which dialogue is presented in an indicia that is unique to each character. The "uniqueness" issue is thus **not** new.

11/06/2002 SMOORE 00000009 194330 09483445

-1-

01 FC:2251

55.00 CH